

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-25, 27, and 29-44 are pending in this application.

Claims 7, 8, 15-17, 23-25, 27, 31, 32, and 37-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-25, 27, and 29-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,898,600 to Isashi in view of U.S. patent 5,208,736 to Crooks et al. (herein “Crooks”).

Addressing first the rejection of claims 7, 8, 15-17, 23-25, 27, 31, 32, and 37-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

With respect to claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32, each of those claims is amended by the present response to now initially recite a “display control means for displaying a system menu” or a “display controller configured to display a system menu”. The amendments to those claims are believed to address the rejections thereto and provide clear antecedent basis for all terms.

With respect to claims 17, 25, 27, and 37-44, those claims now recite “a system menu showing processing items”, to provide clear support for the later recited “the processing items” and “the system menu”. Thus, those claims are now also believed to be clear under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the presently submitted amendments each of the claims is believed to be proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-25, 27, and 29-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Isashi in view of Crooks, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims clarify that the displayed body can both rotate in

open/folding directions and “rotate in a turning direction different from the opening/folding directions”. That claim amendment is submitted to clarify the motions of the display body in the present invention, which is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

More particularly, and with reference to Figure 2 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the display body 30 can open and close in opening/folding directions, see the arrow on the left side of Figure 2. The display body can also be turned and rotated, see the arrow A in Figure 2. That turning is in a different direction from the opening/folding directions, basically perpendicular to the opening/folding directions. That is, in the claimed invention the display body 30 can be opened and rotated in opening/folding directions, and can also be rotated in another essentially perpendicular turning and rotating direction. Those features as clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The primary reference to Isashi is cited with respect to the above-noted features. However, Isashi merely discloses a display body that can be continuously rotated in an opening/folding direction until it is on an opposite side of a keyboard. Stated another way, Isashi discloses a display body that can *only* move in the direction of the arrow on the left side of Figure 2 of the present specification. Isashi does not disclose or suggest the display body being rotated and turned in a different direction from the opening/folding directions as claimed. Again with reference to Figure 2 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a display body 30 can be twisted in the direction indicated by arrow A, which is different than the opening/folding directions indicated by the arrow on the left side of Figure 2. Isashi does not allow any such motion similar to that indicated by arrow A in Figure 2.

Moreover, Crooks is similarly deficient as in Isashi and also does not disclose any rotating and turning direction different from an opening/folding directions. Stated another way, Crooks also does not disclose or suggest that the display body can rotate in a direction such as shown by arrow A in Figure 2 in the present specification.

In such ways, no combination or teachings of Isashi in view of Crooks is believed to fully meet the limitations now recited in each of the independent claims, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom. Thereby, the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\21's\213304\213304US-AF.DOC



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073



Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423